

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claims 1-7, 11-17, 21-27, 31-37, 41-47, 51-57, 61-67, and 71-77 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections.

Claims 1-7, 11-17, 21-27, 31-37, 41, 46-47, 51, 56-57, 61, 66-67, 71, and 76-77 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 41, 51, 61, and 71 are independent. Claims 42-45, 52-55, 62-65, and 72-75 have been canceled. Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 41, 46-47, 51, 56-57, 61, 66-67, 71, and 76-77 have been amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter and their entry is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-7, 11-17, 21-27, 31-37, 41-47, 51-57, 61-67, and 71-77 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 11-17, 21-27, 31-37, 41-47, 51-57, 61-67, and 71-77 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim what the applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated that claims 1-7, 11-17, 21-27, 31-37, 41-47, 51-57, 61-67, and 71-77 improperly recite “selected from a group comprising” and that such language makes the intended scope of claims 1-7, 11-17, 21-27, 31-37, 41-47, 51-57, 61-67, and 71-77 unclear.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 41, 51, 61, and 71 to accommodate the rejection of those claims. Claims 2-7, 12-17, 22-27, and 32-37 properly depend from claims 1, 11, 21, and 31, respectively. Claims 46-47, 56-57, 66-67, and 76-77 properly depend from claims 41, 51, 61, and 71, respectively. Applicants have canceled claims 42-45, 52-55, 62-65, and 72-75 rendering the rejection of them moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims -7, 11-17, 21-27, 31-37, 41-47, 51-57, 61-67, and 71-77.

The Examiner rejected claims 42-45, 52-55, 62-65, and 72-75 as inappropriately reciting “to cause single mode lasing of the wavelength tunable laser.” Applicants have canceled claims 42-45, 52-55, 62-65, and 72-75 rendering the rejection of them moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 42-45, 52-55, 62-65, and 72-75.

The Examiner rejected claims 56 and 57 because they end in commas. Applicants have amended claims 56 and 57 to accommodate the rejection of those claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 56 and 57.

The Examiner rejected claims 61 and 71 as failing to provide antecedent basis for “the active emission section.” Applicants have amended claims 61 and 71 to accommodate the rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 61 and 71.

The Examiner rejected claim 71 because “fro” is misspelled. Applicants have amended claim 71 to accommodate the rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claim 71.


CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all grounds for rejection have been properly accommodated or rendered moot and that the application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 3/24/2004


Jan Little-Washington
Reg. No. 41,181

FIRST CLASS CERTIFICATE OF MAILING


I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on March 24, 2004

Date of Deposit

Adrian Villarreal

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence



Signature

March 24, 2004

Date